

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

21st Year of Publication  
The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXI, No. 19

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

©December 1, 1991

## *As 20th Anniversary Approaches*

### The "War on Cancer"—Big Promises, Modest Gains

Bizarre optimism prevailed when President Richard Nixon, prodded by Congress, signed the National Cancer Act into law on December 23, 1971. The House and Senate had previously adopted resolutions calling for cancer to be cured in time to commemorate the 1976 bicentennial of American independence. With the passage of the Act, research funds rapidly increased, though the promised blank checks were never delivered.

Today, as the 20th anniversary of the signing approaches, what was once commonly referred to as the war on cancer still generates optimistic reports and draws large budget increases. The National Cancer Institute is by far the richest of the 13 institutes in the NIH family, budgeted this year for \$2 billion of the \$9 billion appropriated for all of NIH. The runnerup, the Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, will receive \$1.2 billion. The fiscal disparity between the two institutes is related more to terror than science. Heart diseases of all kinds caused 765,000 deaths in 1988; cancer accounted for 485,000 deaths, but has long ranked as the most feared disease.

#### *DOE to Yield SSC Memos—P.3*

#### *Science Writers Panhandling Again—P.6*

Despite the favorable reports regularly produced by NCI and its allies, the unfortunate reality is that the promised blitz has never materialized and is nowhere in sight. The communique remains better than the cures. And even as new scientific breakthroughs are announced, knowledgeable observers contend that, with some important exceptions, survival rates have improved only modestly over the past two decades while the incidence of several major cancers is actually increasing.

Reported in many industrial countries, the puzzling rise in cancer cases raises volatile questions about the balance of resources between treatment and prevention. And, inevitably, the adequacy of environmental regulations has come into question, though the evidence of pollution and toxic waste as culprits in the increase in cancer is spotty, mixed, and controversial.

The political oddity in all this is that Congress, which rarely hesitates to plunge into any topic, has been extremely timid about undertaking a clearly needed grand review of national cancer strategy. Fearful of the volatility of public dread of cancer, and the ever-present and apparently increas-

ing popularity of "alternative" treatments, the cancer establishment and its many good friends in politics are fearful of a Congressional circus.

In 1981, with the rare return of the Republicans to control of the Senate, the tacit policy of hands-off the cancer program was briefly interrupted by a one-day bumbling hearing chaired by Senator Paula Hawkins (R-Florida). NCI's witnesses snowed the hearing with assurances that all was well. Hawkins praised and thanked them, announced an intention "to continue our inquiry" and "report to Congress and the American people the results of our investigations . . ." But the pursuit ended there.

Since then, the cancer program gets its usual paternalis-

*(Continued on Page 2)*

## In Brief

The National Academy of Sciences is discreetly silent, but it's smarting from a prickly letter from Rep. John Dingell, guardian of the auto industry in homestate Michigan and critic of excessive indirect costs on government projects. The issues merge at the Academy, whose indirect costs are under government review while studies are in progress there on auto emissions and mileage standards. A letter from Dingell to Academy President Frank Press, dated October 14, expresses concern about the staffing of the studies, and notes that the indirect costs charged by the Academy, "taking into consideration our investigations of universities, appear quite high." Dingell added: "I request an explanation."

*Fragmentation of R&D agencies and programs among a slew of Congressional committees is generally seen as a curse on scientific planning and priorities. An attempt at relief is on the way in a bill (H. Con. Res 192; S. Con. Res. 57) to establish a Temporary Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Introducing the resolution on November 19, Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.) said Congress must improve its handling of scientific programs.*

Observing the 20th anniversary of the National Cancer Act, the National Cancer Institute correctly notes that President Nixon "has called the Act one of the most significant actions taken during his Administration. He placed it on a par with his historic trip to China, the first US-Soviet nuclear-arms limitation agreements, and the reduction of forces in Vietnam." Yeah, but there's not a word about the Cancer Act in the 1120-page *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, published in 1978.

## ... Congress Tiptoes Around the Cancer Issue

(Continued from Page 1)

tic review at appropriations time and at the periodic reauthorizations of the Cancer Act. But the proceedings are rarely probing or driven by skepticism. Rather, the general attitude in Congress is: We know you're doing your best against a horrendous problem, but we want you to do even better. This year, as in the past, the attitude is reflected in a major budget increase for NCI—\$275 million, biggest of all at NIH—and specific instructions to do more about breast, colon, and prostate cancers. The reluctance to look hard at NCI is reminiscent of Congressional deference toward the military establishment while the Gulf War was in progress.

Any attempt at a simple snapshot of the status of the war on cancer is fogged by statistical complexities that elude general public understanding. The establishment keeps repeating that things are not as bad as they look, but there's no solace in that for a fearful public.

In terms of deaths attributed to cancer in the United States, the plain numbers are dismaying: 335,000 in 1971 versus 514,000 estimated for 1991. But plain numbers are misleading, since the population has risen from about 200 million to 250 million in those 20 years. And, especially important, more people now live into the advanced ages when cancer is most common.

However, even when the cancer statisticians adjust the figures to account for aging, the increase in incidence of certain types of cancer is alarming. Thus, NCI reports that the incidence of breast cancer rose from 84.8 cases per 100,000 in 1980 to 112.5 in 1987. Arguments rage about the portion of the increase that can be attributed to more and better diagnosis, but there appears to be agreement that some significant increase in incidence has in fact occurred. While much of the near-term increase may be due to improved surveillance, NCI says that "the long-term increase in breast cancer incidence is difficult to explain."

Other types of cancer have also been reported on the rise. Brain cancer in persons under age 45 increased by 2 percent a year between 1973 and 1987, according to a report this year in the *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*. The authors noted that similar increases have occurred in Britain, West Germany, France and Italy. They disputed the possibility that reports of higher incidence were attributable to the widening use of improved diagnostic techniques.

The managers of the federal cancer program point out that among cancer patients under 65, earlier detection and improved treatments are cutting the death toll in many types of cancers. Thus, between 1973 and 1986, the mortality rate for bladder cancer decreased by 29 percent, while the rate for the so-called children's cancers fell by 35 percent. And they point out that developments in surgical techniques and other treatments have contributed to patient comfort and improvements in quality of life.

But critics note that in the over-65 population, the death rate from cancer is on the rise. Among white males ages 65-

74, the cancer death rate per 100,000 stood at 798 in 1950, rose to 1070 in 1980, then declined slightly, to 1050 in 1988.

The indications of increased incidence, murky as they may be, have aroused questions about whether the war on cancer has devoted sufficient attention and resources to prevention. Prominent among those raising this issue is John Bailar, MD, Professor of Epidemiology and Biostatistics in the Faculty of Medicine at McGill University, and for many years statistical consultant to the *New England Journal of Medicine*. While many colleagues have whispered similar views, Bailar has spoken out, and often has reaped derision for his courage.

Bailar expressed his views in *Trends in Cancer Mortality in Industrial Countries*, a collection published last year by the New York Academy of Sciences. Noting that cancer death rates for older ages have increased rapidly, he asserted that "the worldwide effort to control cancer has failed to attain its primary objective—substantial reduction of the overall cancer death rate—despite 40 years of intense effort that has been focused mostly on treatment." The urgent need, he said, "is to increase research efforts to find more effective, more feasible ways to prevent cancer."

Is environmental contamination the villain in the increase in various cancers? A recent report by the traditionally cautious National Academy of Sciences, *Environmental Epidemiology: Public Health and Hazardous Waste*, notes that 40 million people live near major hazardous-waste dumps, but that little research has been conducted to ascertain the health effects of that proximity. Prevention is no longer as neglected as it once was in NCI's strategy and budget. But at the dawn of the third decade of the war on cancer, the trends in incidence and mortality are not reassuring, even when the major villain in cancer, cigarette smoking, is accounted for in the dismal statistics.

Would a free-ranging Congressional inquiry into cancer strategy serve a useful purpose? There's no guarantee, but the starting point should be the recognition that progress has been poor and the program has gone unexamined for far too long.—DSG

---

### © 1991, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**  
European Correspondent  
**Francois Seguier (Paris)**

Associate Publisher  
**Wanda J. Reif**  
Circulation Manager  
**Glen D. Grant**

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$358.00 (two years, \$610.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

## Super Collider Memos Loosened by Subpoena Threat

Warned that both Republican and Democratic members were sufficiently fed up to issue a subpoena, the Department of Energy (DOE) has agreed to permit a House Subcommittee to examine long-withheld reports from the program manager of the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) to DOE Secretary James Watkins.

The concession, after several attempts at evasion, is likely to uncover even more deception in the long campaign to develop and maintain Congressional support for the SSC. Last spring, an initial haul of internal documents from DOE revealed that the Department had essentially given up on obtaining foreign contributions for the SSC in the foreseeable future. Nonetheless, DOE was simultaneously assuring Congress that money from abroad could confidently be expected [SGR, May 15: "Hearing Assails SSC's Empty Promises, Rising Cost"]. The newly sought documents are expected to shed light on misrepresentations of cost estimates for the SSC.

Deception in government is naughty by textbook standards, but the SSC's progress on Capitol Hill has not suffered a bit from the general recognition that Congress is being taken for a costly ride. With contracts spread nationwide, and nearly \$500 million voted for the SSC this year—including \$373 million for construction—the political point of no return has probably been safely passed.

Secretary Watkins has labored to break DOE of its proclivity for deception, a characteristic nurtured from the early days of nuclear secrecy under DOE's predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission. But the forked tongue persists in many of DOE's dealings with outsiders. DOE insisted last spring that all requested documents had been delivered to the inquiring Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Pressed by the Subcommittee, which had obtained contrary information, DOE acknowledged the existence of reports from SSC Program Manager Joseph R. Cipriano to Secretary Watkins, but said the Subcommittee could not have them. Possessing statutory authority to examine internal records of agencies within its jurisdiction, the Subcommittee grew more interested in the withheld documents.

A Subcommittee staff member told SGR that it was learned that the reports traveled along a "back channel" at DOE, "without resort to the normal chain of command," and without being logged in DOE's records in the customary fashion. The Subcommittee renewed its request for the papers. DOE responded that some of the requested documents had been destroyed. The threat of a subpoena was followed by delivery of some of the sought-after Cipriano-to-Watkins memoranda—with large sections blanked out.

Informed that the votes were assured and that the Subcommittee was scheduled to meet on November 21 to issue a subpoena, DOE said Subcommittee staff would be permitted to read unexpurgated copies of the documents. Still to be

settled is whether the staff can take away copies, but that's considered to be a matter of minor importance for illuminating the tawdry politics of the SSC. The subject has become a passion of Subcommittee Chairman Howard Wolpe (D-Michigan) and his anti-SSC comrade-in-arms, Rep. Sherwood Boehlert, of New York, the senior Republican on the Subcommittee. But at this stage, it is doubtful that even more scurrilous disclosures could impair the SSC.

The one remaining difficulty to be surmounted is money, a topic on which DOE has routinely mangled the truth to

### Background Reading on the SSC

*Status of the Superconducting Super Collider Program* (No. 40; 240 pp., no charge), testimony last May by DOE officials and analysts from the General Accounting Office, before Congress's leading SSC-bashers, Reps. Howard Wolpe (D-Michigan) and Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY).

Order from: House of Representatives, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, Annex I, Room 822, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/225-4494.

*Establishing Priorities in Science Funding* (Serial No. 3-2; 285 pp., no charge), mega-project defenders from DOE and NASA jousting last July with skeptical Congressmen, whose doubts were reinforced by several outspoken academic physicists.

Order from: House of Representatives, Committee on the Budget, Annex I, Publications Office, Room 214, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/226-7217.

allay fears that the SSC would cannibalize other parts of its physics program. In 1989, the cost of the SSC was estimated at \$5.9 billion in "as spent" dollars. With skeptics in Congress and elsewhere disputing that estimate, DOE last year announced an official price tag of \$8.2 billion, a figure conjured up by the SSC's managers and beneficiaries.

Under Congressional prodding, it was later revealed that the new estimate was about \$3 billion below the figure calculated by a team of disinterested civil servants deep inside the Department. Since the lower price was more politically palatable, DOE brushed aside its own estimate.

The White House has pledged that one third of the cost would come from non-federal sources. Texas, site of the machine, has pledged \$1 billion, which leaves about \$1.7 billion to be raised from abroad. Europe, strained by its own ambitions in particle physics, has declined a solicitation, while Japan remains coy. White House Science Adviser D. Allan Bromley conferred in Tokyo with Japanese research officials in mid-October. He came away with nothing more than the usual assurance of serious consideration, even after raising the novel option of Japan becoming part owner of the SSC [SGR, September 15, November 1].

(Continued on Page 4)

## AFL-CIO Analysis Scoffs at Scientist "Shortage"

*From "Shortage of Scientists and Engineers: Crisis or Hype?" in the fall issue of Interface, quarterly newsletter of the Department for Professional Employees, AFL-CIO, by Dennis Chamot, Executive Assistant to the President of the Department.*

[V]arious leaders in the education and technical communities, including NSF itself, have raised the specter of a looming shortage of technical professionals. . . . But what if they are wrong? Then increasing the supply of scientists and engineers would hold down salaries, reduce employment opportunities, and in the long run discourage even more young people from pursuing these areas of study. . . .

If a real shortage exists, one would expect to see an effect on salaries. . . . In other words, if employers were having difficulty filling positions, they would offer high salaries to fill their needs. This question has been looked at by the Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel of the National Research Council . . . [The data] shows that despite the enormous increase in demand for engineers (as reflected in the huge increase in numbers of engineers employed over the period examined) real salaries, corrected for inflation, did not increase at all from 1972 to 1990. If anything there was

a slight drop during the past four years. This is true at all experience levels, including new hires. . . . A similar situation obtains for industrial chemists. . . .

So, where is the concern about shortages coming from? Perhaps another way to put the question would be to ask who benefits from a surplus. Clearly not working scientists and engineers—oversupply holds down salaries and makes it more difficult to find good jobs.

I suggest two sources. One is certain elements of the business community, a minority, who in fact want to pay low salaries; some of these companies desire to employ foreign engineers at less than going rates of pay, and want to convince the Department of Labor that shortages exist. The other source of complaint, and by far the most vocal, is the university establishment. In fact, one could make a convincing case that there is a real problem here, in that many universities are having trouble attracting American students, especially into their graduate programs, and are relying heavily on foreign talent for new faculty.

The problem for the rest of us is that the universities (and academically oriented organizations like NSF) have generalized their view of the crisis. I'm convinced there is no general shortage. I don't believe there will be one in the foreseeable future.

## Supercollider

*(Continued from Page 3)*

The tactical plan for this latest effort to obtain Japanese money called for Bromley's sales pitch to be followed up by President Bush during the visit he was scheduled to make to Japan at the end of November. The trip was hurriedly postponed following Election Day's unhappy outcome for the President, and is now scheduled for the end of December.

DOE's candid assessment of the SSC's prospects in Japan was revealed in an internal staff memo, dated October 30, 1990, that Wolpe's Subcommittee obtained for its hearings last May. "The SSC does not have the complete support of the Japanese physics community," the DOE memo reported, "and the Japanese government has stated that any decision will take at least a year to make and will likely require a new budget category and possibly some realignments among their science agencies."

A year has passed without any sign of a change in Tokyo. Meanwhile, DOE still insists that foreign aid is sure to come, and has even raised the possibility that the bankrupt ex-Soviet Union will help pay for the SSC. But the prospects of money from abroad are so dim that Fred Bucy, former President of Texas Instruments, resigned last spring as head of the Texas SSC Commission to devote himself to persuading Congress to finance the SSC without foreign assistance.

The contents of the Cipriano memos may put some light on DOE's realistic assessment of the costs, generally antici-

pated to be well above the \$8.2 billion estimate. But the real figure would have to be far beyond that amount to overcome the pro-SSC coalition of pork-sniffing legislators, construction and instrument contractors, Texan George Bush, and the particle-physics mafia.

The evaporation of ethical values within the scientific establishment is virtually so complete that rarely is a dissenting whisper heard about the biggest basic-research venture of our time riding to success on a stream of mistruths and deceptions.

A few old-fashioned believers in scientific rectitude have come forward and expressed their misgivings and disdain in public—often to be rewarded with the scorn of their colleagues. Prominent among the outspoken critics are Robert Richardson, Professor of Physics at Cornell, and Philip Anderson, Professor of Physics at Princeton. Testifying at House Budget Committee hearings in July, both disputed the high priority the SSC holds in the financing of physics [SGR, August 1]. Their words were appreciatively received by members of the Budget Committee, but the proceedings had no effect on funding or priorities.

Other fields of physics are waking up to the fiscal implications of the SSC. A study for DOE, chaired by Nobel laureate Charles Townes, makes it clear that, given strict budget ceilings, the SSC can thrive only at the expense of other projects. That outcome was evident long ago. But the physicists who will suffer from the SSC were lulled by promises of a mega-project financed by miracles.—DSG



## Medical Society Rapped for Electing Copyright Violator

A serene existence has long been the fortunate lot of Alpha Omega Alpha, the national medical honor society. But suddenly the 70,000-member organization has been confronted by a nasty conflict arising from the election of an academic physician who lost a court fight in which he was accused of filching a colleague's writings.

The physician is Leonard Freeman, Vice Chairman of the Department of Nuclear Medicine at Montefiore Medical Center, a teaching hospital of Yeshiva University's Albert Einstein College of Medicine, in New York City. Freeman's one-time protege and rising star in the department, Heidi Weissmann, MD, contends she was fired in 1987 after she accused him of taking her name off a syllabus she had written and representing it as his own work [SGR, May 1, 1990: "Plagiarist Gets Promoted, Victim Is Out of Her Job"].

He responded that they had long engaged in collaborative writing and sharing of texts. Montefiore says she voluntarily left her job. Weissmann lost a copyright suit in a US District Court trial, but won a 2-1 reversal from the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which stated that by taking Weissmann's work, Freeman "stood to gain recognition among his peers and in the profession . . . without paying the usual price that accompanies scientific research and writing, that is to say, by the sweat of his brow."

In October 1989, the US Supreme Court refused to review the case, thus leaving the Appeals decision intact. Though victorious, Weissmann not only remains unemployed, but has been advised by Montefiore that for having engaged in "joint and interchangeable authorship," she, along with Freeman, may be guilty of scientific misconduct. The matter is under investigation, while a lawsuit filed by Weissmann against Montefiore, Freeman, and others is pending.

Weissmann rejected Montefiore's offer of \$150,000 if she would refrain from legal action and advise "the Congressional Committee investigating academic misconduct" that Freeman "did not engage in any scientific misconduct or breach of professional ethics." The reference was to a House Government Operations Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Ted Weiss (D-NY), which off and on has investigated academe's handling of misconduct cases, including the Weissmann affair.

Meanwhile, Freeman's alma mater, the Chicago Medical School, chose this year to honor him with membership in Alpha Omega Alpha in the highly select Alumnus Category. The matter would ordinarily pass with little notice, but the Weissmann case has engendered a good deal of bitterness toward Freeman and Montefiore. Letters of protest began to arrive at AOA's national office in Menlo Park, California. After "15 or 20" had been received, the AOA's Executive Secretary, Robert J. Glaser, MD, prepared a form response, dated November 14, beginning, "Because I have received such a large number of letters regarding the election of Dr.

Leonard Freeman . . ."

Glaser advised his irate correspondents that AOA's chapters are autonomous in elections and that the organization's "Constitution currently provides no mechanism whereby membership can be rescinded once it is granted. Following receipt of your letters," he continued, "we in the national office conferred with our legal counsel, who reiterated that, at the present time, the society's Board of Directors is not empowered to revoke the election of any member."

The AOA's Executive Secretary did note, however, that the Board of Directors had asked him on November 6 to "review the circumstances of Dr. Freeman's election directly with the Chicago Medical School chapter. Further, we will consider the possibility of amending the constitution bylaws to provide a mechanism for review of the election process."

In closing, Glaser wrote, "I do feel obliged to point out that, in my association with the society for well over thirty years, we have never encountered a problem like this, and all of us deeply regret its occurrence."

## Debut Set for Feder-Stewart "Plagiarism Machine"

Long reported under development, the Stewart-Feder Plagiarism Machine, a computer programmed to match suspiciously similar texts, is scheduled for its battlefield debut December 9 in a US District Court trial in New York.

At issue is a copyright suit brought by the trustee for heirs of John Converse, editor of and contributor to a multi-volume standard work, *Converse: Reconstructive Plastic Surgery*, published in 1964 and 1977 editions by W.B. Saunders. Converse, who died in 1981, was Director of the Institute of Reconstructive Plastic Surgery at NYU, and was succeeded in that post by his longtime protege and assistant Joseph G. McCarthy.

The trustee charges that in violation of Converse's contract with Saunders, a third edition, titled *McCarthy: Plastic Surgery*, was published in 1989, with McCarthy as editor, without the requisite approval of Converse or his heirs; also that great chunks of the McCarthy version were lifted intact from the Converse editions, without attribution and only superficial acknowledgement of Converse's place in the history of plastic surgery. The charges are denied by McCarthy and Saunders, which holds the copyright on the Converse editions.

Joining the fray, *pro bono*, are NIH misconduct sentinels, Walter Stewart and Ned Feder, who scanned the disputed texts into their computer. Stewart, who is scheduled to testify for the Converse team, said the computerized matching shows that numerous sections of the McCarthy edition were taken verbatim from the Converse editions and that many other sections were published with minor changes.

## Science Writers Hit Academy for \$1000 Party Money

The DC Science Writers Association is back on the take from the science establishment after having gone straight for one meeting. The acceptance of alms is accompanied by evidence of some embarrassment, though not much, about science journalists panhandling from organizations prominent in national science affairs.

The recidivism has led to a deal to accept a donation of \$1000 from the National Academy of Sciences to help pay for DCSWA's annual holiday-season party, scheduled for December 3 in the splendid Great Hall of the Academy. DCSWA members will provide another \$1000, at rate of \$8 per head. Following the party, David A. Kessler, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, is scheduled to address the members.

Numbering about 225 members employed in science reporting, editing, and public-relations in the Washington area, DCSWA has put the bite on major scientific organizations in and around the capital throughout its three-year existence [SGR, October 1: "DC Science Writers Blaze New Path to Hospitality"]. The tactic is rare if not unique among associations of journalists.

As practiced by an association, rather than an individual, DCSWA's fund-raising method apparently falls in an ethical gray area. Many of the news organizations that employ DCSWA members have strict prohibitions against their reporters and editors engaging in financial dealings with news sources—among which DCSWA's benefactors are prominent in the business. But the subsidization of DCSWA's social and lecture events does not seem to have aroused any concerns among the members' employers.

Besides the Academy, which DCSWA tagged for a party last year, the benefactors include the National Science Foundation, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and the National Geographic Society.

The question of propriety was raised last July by SGR Editor Greenberg in a letter to DCSWA President David Wheeler, of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. The letter was written after DCSWA members were informed that the Association would meet July 16 at the National Science Foundation, with NSF "providing the food," as it had on a previous occasion.

Just prior to the meeting, however, NSF, which regularly pleads impoverishment to its paymasters on Capitol Hill, advised DCSWA that it would have to attend to its own sustenance.

At a meeting of the DCSWA Board of Directors in September, Wheeler brought up the issue of DCSWA's mode of financing its get-togethers. The issue arose in anticipation of a September session in collaboration with the multi-billion-dollar Howard Hughes Medical Institute. As related in DCSWA's newsletter for members, the Board was "asked if we shouldn't turn over our [\$5] cover charge to Howard Hughes. The initial vote was close but we decided

to keep the money and left the institute paying for all food and drink."

At a reported \$26 per head for the 55 DCSWA members who attended, the evening was a rock-bottom public-relations bargain for the image-sensitive Hughes Institute. Founded by Howard Hughes as a tax dodge, the Institute has since become safely established as an upright philanthropy. But the transition to respectability occurred only after much travail with the Internal Revenue Service and an embarrassing episode about interior decoration of Hughes headquarters on an imperial scale.

For its October meeting, DCSWA went straight. It assembled in facilities provided gratis by the World Bank—off the beaten reportorial track for science writers—and paid for its own food and drink and heard talks about agricultural research.

But the burden of journalistic rectitude was onerous, as revealed in President Wheeler's November 15 newsletter, announcing the December 3 festivity and lecture at the National Academy of Sciences. "We're splitting expenses in half with the Academy," the newsletter stated, "and we've invited our friends in the American Medical Writers Association to join us for this event."

The newsletter then proceeded to explain: "As you can see from the next event [the party and lecture at the National Academy of Sciences] we are generally, if not always, going to make it a point not to let the hosts also provide the speakers. I doubt if we'll let anyone pick up the entire tab for an event again. If someone wants to host us . . . that's fine, but they will probably also not be part of the program. I personally would like to see more events where we can do our own catering . . . and pay all of our own costs."

The DCSWA newsletter continued: "Victor Cohn of the *Washington Post*, who certainly qualifies as a senior statesman among medical writers, called me up to vote for Dan Greenberg's side of this controversy. Victor did suggest a little more flexibility than Dan's position, which is, as I understand it, don't meet at any scientific institutions and don't take any food from them. Victor said some scientific and medical societies used to put liquor in the press rooms at meetings until NASW [National Association of Science Writers] officers called them up to tell them it wasn't necessary."

"I've had a trickle of comments from all quarters on this matter," the DCSWA newsletter added, "including one comment (not mine) that we meet at the Howard Hughes Medical Institute at least once a year. The food was pretty good."

SGR's inquiry about the genesis of the holiday-season meeting at the National Academy of Sciences brought out that it was mutually agreed upon by the leaders of DCSWA and the Academy's head of public relations, Steve Push, who volunteered to SGR that the Academy's \$1000 donation would not be charged to indirect costs.—DSG

## More in Print: Science & Diplomacy—Purified Version

(Continued from Page 8)

**Science, Technology, and American Diplomacy: 1991** (Serial D, 412 pp., no charge), 12th annual report by the President, delayed in publication to cleanse a section that White House ideologues deemed too sympathetic to government promotion of high-tech industry—i.e., “industrial policy,” abominated by Bush’s rightist henchmen. The report, mandated by Congress and considered a nuisance at the White House and the State Department, consists mainly of lists summarizing hundreds of international S&T agreements, the agencies that manage them, plus superficial discussions of international S&T issues, etc.

This edition contains a lukewarm introduction by House Chairmen Dante Fascell of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and George Brown of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, who note that the report was “more than six months late” (due January 1, delivered by the White House late in June, and just off the Congressional press). Unstated is the reason for the delay: The chapter on “Economic Competitiveness,” drafted by the Commerce Department, was rejected by the Office of Management Budget as a thinly disguised brief for industrial policy. The rewritten version consists of eight innocuous pages.

Order from: House of Representatives, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Science, 2319 Rayburn Building, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 225-8844.

**Reproductive and Developmental Toxicants: Regulatory Actions Provide Uncertain Protection** (GAO/PEMD-92-3; 116 pp., no charge), by the General Accounting Office (GAO), research agency for the Congress, in response to questions from the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs concerning the adequacy of federal surveillance and regulation of toxicants that might affect human reproduction and development. Reporting that no federal agency could provide a list of such substances, GAO says it compiled a list of 30 with the assistance of state governments and over 50 individual researchers (named in the report).

Virtually all the substances had been the object of at least one regulatory action, GAO says, but the regulations were marked by gaps and inconsistencies and little attention to reproductive and developmental toxicity. Without identifying them, GAO says officials of regulatory agencies “assert that lists [of toxic substances] are not detailed enough to be useful for regulation, they may misinform, be misused, or even alarm women into unnecessary abortions.” The agencies mentioned in the report are the Department of Health and Human Services, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Also from GAO: **Health Care Spending Control: The Experience of France, Germany, and Japan** (GAO/HRD-

92-9; 70 pp., no charge), says the three countries under study match the US in reliance on private physicians and public and private hospitals, the provision of most health insurance through the workplace, and insurance by multiple third-party payers. But they do it cheaper, GAO reports, because all health-care prices are controlled and standardized and each country strives, though with varying results, to set limits on national health spending.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20877; tel. 202/275-6241.

**Federal Options for Reducing Waste Disposal** (85 pp., no charge), by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), reports that solid waste in the US, four pounds per person in 1988, will rise to 4.2 in 1995. CBO analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of four economic techniques for resisting the tide: combined disposal tax and reuse subsidy, virgin material tax, investment tax credit for recycling, and recycling credit system. An appendix to the report discusses the effects the techniques might have on the disposal of newspapers.

Order from: Congressional Budget Office, Publications, 2d and D Sts. SW, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/226-2809.

**Looking for Leadership: The Public, Competitiveness and Campaign '92** (10 pp., no charge), another sign of the political ascent of the government-and-technology issue, from the industry-backed Council on Competitiveness, an opinion survey in which the respondents overwhelmingly favor, among other things, “more tax funding for R&D on cutting-edge technologies . . .”

Order from: Council on Competitiveness, 900 17th St. NW, Suite 1050, Washington, DC 20006; tel. 202/785-3990.

### To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station, Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please Bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$358.00 ☐;

two years, \$610.00 ☐

(Foreign airmail, \$35.00 per year; foreign surface \$15.00 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970;  
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054

## In Print: Industrial Competition, Ex-Soviet R&D, Etc.

*The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.*

**Competing Economies: America, Europe, and the Pacific Rim** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01260-0; 376 pp., \$17), by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, the last of three reports on the woes of the American industrial economy, which OTA describes as "beleaguered by Japanese competitors" and in trouble with many European ones, as well. Reflecting OTA's capacity for worldwide collection and analysis of large quantities of data, the report describes the settings for industrial performance of the economic superpowers. OTA concludes that the American economy is handicapped by a lack of industrial promotion by government, compounded by indifference on the part of industry. A central topic of the report is the importance of institutional arrangements for linking the creation and commercialization of technology. OTA, usually shy about making explicit recommendations, writes warmly here about a major expansion of the federal role, noting that "except for the United States, most developed nations have some kind of government program to promote the competitiveness of high-technology industries."

A 35 pp. summary of the report is available without charge from: Office of Technology Assessment, Publications, US Congress, Washington, DC 20510-8025; tel. 202/228-6204.

Order the full report from: USGPO, Superintendent of Documents, Dept. 33, Washington, DC 20402-9325; tel. 202/783-3238.

Also available from USGPO, the second report in the OTA industrial series: **Making Things Better: Competing in Manufacturing** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01178-6; 1990, 244 pp., \$11; summary from OTA without charge).

The first report in the series, **Paying the Bill: Manufacturing and America's Trade Deficit** (NTIS Order No. PB88-229539; 1988, 93 pp., \$19), is available from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22161-0001; tel. 703/487-4650.

**Soviet Civilian Research and Development Facilities and Funding** (91-778 SPR; 14 pp., no charge), from the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service (CRS, part of the Library of Congress), a cautious examination of what might lie ahead for the ex-Soviet R&D enterprise, starting with an overview of its layout prior to the decomposition of the USSR. The report, by William C. Boesman and Genevieve J. Knezo, Specialists in Science and Technology, notes that a limited decentralization of R&D started before the deluge. Also, that last January, the Russian Republic Supreme Soviet had decreed a takeover of facilities and buildings of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, the traditional holding company for some 70 percent of the basic research in the former USSR. But, as of

### OTA: Publications and Projects

The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has issued a new **Catalog of Publications** (36 pp.), listing scores of OTA reports produced over the past several years on a wide variety of topics, including energy, space, science policy, environment, oceans, agriculture and forestry, biological research, and materials. Directions are given for ordering copies of the reports.

OTA has also issued a summary of its work in progress, **Assessment Activities**. Included are names and telephone numbers of project directors, the Congressional committees requesting the studies, and scheduled dates of completion.

Both publications are available without charge from: OTA, Publications, US Congress, Washington, DC 20510-8025; tel. 202/228-6204.

September 11, the report states, control of the Academy buildings in Moscow remained unchanged. In the end, the crystal ball for this topic is cloudy: "It is unclear yet," the report states, "as to whether the basic science system will continue to be governed by the Academy/institute structure, whether more independent institutes funded on a competitive grants basis will arise, or whether universities will begin to do more basic research."

Also available, a related CRS report, issued last February: **Eastern European and Soviet Science and Technology** (91-114 SPR; 34 pp., no charge).

Another from CRS: **Magnetic Fusion Energy** (IB91039; 14 pp., no charge), by Richard E. Rowberg, Chief of the Science Policy Research Division, a review of the Department of Energy's slimmed fusion plans, now concentrated on magnetic fusion, to the near-exclusion of alternatives. But the \$337 million requested by DOE and approved by Congress for this year, Rowberg points out, is "well below the constrained budget path" recommended by DOE's Fusion Policy Advisory Committee and adds risks to the venture.

Citing the strong tradition of international collaboration in fusion research, the report notes an upcoming global competition to provide a site for the \$4.9 billion International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER), scheduled to be operating by 2005. ITER's partners, the US, Europe, and Japan, have settled on three sites for the preceding step, a \$1 billion Engineering Design Activity (EDA). The reason, Rowberg suggests, "may be concern that if the EDA were to be centered in one location, that partner would be in the strongest position to claim the ITER construction site."

Order from: Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Madison Building, Washington, DC 20540; attn. Ms. Raap; tel. 202/707-7014.

(Continued on Page 7)



